



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,581	03/16/2001	Leo J. Campbell	08049.0005	5903

22852 7590 04/20/2007
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,581

Applicant(s)

CAMPBELL ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R. Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-27, 50-59, 69-70, 76-77, 79, 81, 83-86 and 88-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-27, 50-59, 69-70, 76-77, 79, 81, 83-86, 88-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2155

Detailed Action

Claims 18-27, 50-59, 69, 70, 76, 77, 79, 81, 83-86, 88-91 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 18, 23, 50, 55, 69, 70, 76 and 77 are amended.

Claims 1-17, 28-49, 60-68, 71-75, 78, 80, 82, 87 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/15/06 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based on amendments. See remarks below.

Claim Objections

Claim 88 is objected to because of the following informalities: the last limitation states "the delivery point identification value" which lacks antecedent basis but the examiner believes applicant meant key instead of value. Appropriate correction is required.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2155

Claims 18-20, 22, 50-52, 54 and 55-57, 59, 69 and 76; 79, 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse.

Regarding claim 18, the King reference teaches a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an electronic address associated with the user's electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23);

determining a standardized physical address of the user from the electronic address using an address database (King: page 2, para 22-23); and

delivering the message to the user (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30),

The King reference fails to teach 9 digit zip codes.

However the Whitehouse reference teaches using a non-standardized physical address includes a 5-digit ZIP code to get a standardized physical address includes a 9 digit ZIP code (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 67- col. 6, line 5; col. 2, lines 43-49) in order to further identify the destination address (Whitehouse: col. 2, lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method for delivering a message as taught by King to include standardizing zip codes with zip+4 codes in order to further identify the destination address.

Regarding claim 19, the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the electronic address (King: page 2, para 30).

Regarding claim 20, the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the standardized physical address (King: page 2-3, para 31-32).

Regarding claim 22, the method of claim 18, wherein the address database is a United States Postal Service address database (King: page 2, para 22).

Art Unit: 2155

Claims 50-52, 54, 69 and 76 are rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Regarding claim 79, the King reference teaches a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an electronic address associated with the user's electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23);

determining a delivery point identification key using the electronic address, wherein the delivery point identification key points to a location in an address database, the location associated with a standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2, para 20-23); and

delivering the message to the user at the standardized physical address, the delivering based on the delivery point identification key, wherein the non-standardized physical address.

The King reference fails to teach 9 digit zip codes.

However the Whitehouse reference teaches using a non-standardized physical address includes a 5-digit ZIP code to get a standardized physical address includes a 9 digit ZIP code (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 67- col. 6, line 5; col. 2, lines 43-49) in order to further identify the destination address (Whitehouse: col. 2, lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method for delivering a message as taught by King to include standardizing zip codes with zip+4 codes in order to further identify the destination address.

Regarding claim 86, the King reference teaches a system for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

a receiving component configured to receive the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an electronic address associated with the user's electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23); and

a determining component configured to determine a delivery point identification key using the electronic address, wherein the delivery point identification key points to a location in an address database, the location associated with a standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2, para 20-23); and

delivering the message to the user at the standardized physical address, the delivering based on the delivery point identification key, wherein the non-standardized physical address.

The King reference fails to teach 9 digit zip codes.

However the Whitehouse reference teaches using a non-standardized physical address includes a 5-digit ZIP code to get a standardized physical address includes a 9 digit ZIP code (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 67- col. 6, line 5; col. 2, lines 43-49) in order to further identify the destination address (Whitehouse: col. 2, lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method for delivering a message as taught by King to include standardizing zip codes with zip+4 codes in order to further identify the destination address.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 23-25, 27, 55-57, 59, 70 and 77; 81, 85, 88, 90-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al.

Regarding claim 23, the King reference teaches a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes a non-standardized electronic address of the user and a physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23);

determining a standardized electronic address of the user from the physical address using an address database (King: page 2, para 22-23); and

delivering the message to the user (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30).

Regarding claim 24, the method of claim 23, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the standardized electronic address (King: page 2, para 30).

Regarding claim 25, the method of claim 23, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the physical address (King: page 2-3, para 31-32).

Regarding claim 27, the method of claim 23, wherein the address database is a United States Postal Service address database (King: page 2, para 22).

Claims 55-57, 59, 70 and 77 are rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Regarding claim 81, a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes a non-standardized electronic address and a physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23); and

determining a delivery point identification key using the physical address, wherein the delivery point identification key points to a location in an address database, the location associated with a standardized electronic address of the user (King: page 2, para 20-23) and

delivering the message to the user at the standardized electronic address, the delivering based on the delivery point identification key (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30).

Regarding claim 85, the method of claim 81, wherein the standardized electronic address includes a vanity e-mail address (King: page 2, para 22).

Regarding claim 88, a system for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising:

a receiving component configured to receive the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an non-standardized electronic address of the user and a physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23); and

a determining component configured to determine a delivery point identification key using the physical address, wherein the delivery point identification key points to a location in an address database (King: page 2, para 20-23),

the location associated with a standardized electronic address of the user (King: page 2, para 22); and

Art Unit: 2155

a delivering component configured to deliver the message to the user at the standardized electronic address, the delivering based on the delivery point identification value (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30).

Regarding claim 90, the system of claim 88, wherein the standardized electronic address includes a telephone number (King: page 2, para 22).

Regarding claim 91, the system of claim 88, wherein the standardized electronic address includes a vanity e-mail address (King: page 2, para 22).

Art Unit: 2155

Claims 21, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse.

Regarding claim 21, the King and the '505 reference teach the method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account.

The King and '505 references does not explicitly state sending back information of a standardized physical address.

However the Whitehouse reference teaches sending back information of a complete physical address (Whitehouse: col. 6, lines 52-58) in order to providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of delivering a message as taught by King to include informing the sender of a complete address as taught by Whitehouse in order to remove the last barrier for automation providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

Claim 53 is rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Claims 26, 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse.

Regarding claim 26, the King reference teaches the method of claim 23.

The King reference does not teach informing the sender of the complete electronic address. However the Whitehouse reference teaches informing the sender of the standardized electronic address (Whitehouse: col. 6, lines 52-58) in order to providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

Art Unit: 2155

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of delivering a message as taught by King to include informing the sender of a complete address as taught by Whitehouse in order to remove the last barrier for automation providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

Claim 58 is rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Claims 83 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al.

Regarding claim 83, the King reference teaches the method of claim 81. The King reference fails to teach fax numbers. However, the King reference teaches telephone numbers and messages routed to a printer so that the user can receive a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of delivering messages as taught by King to include a facsimile number in order to provide the user with a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32)

Regarding claim 89, the King reference teaches the system of claim 88. The King reference fails to teach fax numbers. However, the King reference teaches telephone numbers and messages routed to a printer so that the user can receive a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of delivering messages as taught by King to include a facsimile number in order to provide the user with a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32).

REMARKS

Art Unit: 2155

Applicant has removed the 112 issues and has presented arguments to each of the previous and amended limitations.

The Applicant Argues:

1. King fails to teach the limitations of claims 18, 50, 69, 76, and 79 arguments page 14.
2. King fails to teach the limitations of claims 23, 55, 70 and 77 arguments page 16.
3. King fails to teach the limitations of claim 81 and 88, arguments page 17-18
4. King fails to teach the limitations of claims 79 and 86, arguments page 18-19.
5. King fails to teach the limitations of claims 83 and 89.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

1* The prior art references of King in view of Whitehouse do teach all the claim elements with motivation to combine and a reasonable expectation of success. King is relied upon to teach the broad claim language of a method, system, computer usable medium, and system with means for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account. The examiner stresses that applicant has broadly claimed the limitations with very little associations between the message and electronic account. The claim limitations are mapped above.

With respect to “receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account, where the message includes an electronic address associated with the user’s electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user from the electronic address using an address database” King shows on pages 1 and 2, para 18-23. King shows a user sending a message to a person with an electronic account, Santa para 20 where the user selects santa as a recipient. Santa has an an electronic account to receive the email and physical address. The reference teaches determining recipient’s physical address in para 20 by searching an address database by the USPS and subsequent delivery of the message. The non-standardized physical address has not been explicitly defined and examiner interprets this to be the name of zip code, state or other useful information.

2* The prior art King reference teaches the claimed limitations. With respect to “determining a standardized electronic address of the user from the physical address using an address database” King teaches on page 2, para 20-23 that if the sender does not

Art Unit: 2155

know the recipients full address they can search using zip code, state, and other information to populate the address line of an e-mail. This teaches determining a standardized electronic address (address in email) from the physical address. Fig. 1 disputes applicant's argument that it is only sent to the physical address and shows that in one embodiment it is used to address and send an email.

3* There is an inconsistency between the use of the term 'key' and the term 'value' in the arguments. While the claims teach a key, the applicant refers to a value in the arguments and in claim 88. The key is interpreted to be the handle or actual electronic address of the recipient such as "Santa Clause" that is directly linked with the physical address of the recipient. King's sending a physical or electronic message and lookup and addressing based on search of either covers these broad limitations. King: Fig. 1.

4* Similar to argument no. 3 above, applicant needs to distinguish delivery point identification key from a handle or address that is directly linked and references a physical address and visa versa.

5* The Whitehouse reference is not needed for the alleged deficiencies of King. King teaches the limitations as claimed. King teaches Zip codes but Whitehouse is relied upon to show the lack of novelty in 5 and 9 digit zip codes as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

BRB



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER